ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. In particular, claims 1, 2, 13, 18, and 31 have been amended. It is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 9, 12, 13, 16-18 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over FILTERSTAR, S/ENS:841553-01 Inlet pipe; S/ENS:841545-01 Outlet pipe; 3 pages in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,542,451 to Foster. Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over FILTERSTAR, S/ENS:841553-01 Inlet pipe; S/ENS:841545-01 Outlet pipe; 3 pages in view of Foster in and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,125,791 to Gunderson et al. Independent claims 1, 18 and 31 have been amended to more distinctly point out the patentable subject matter. In addition, dependent claims 2 and 13 have been amended to conform to the corresponding amended independent claims. In view of these amendments, we believe that independent claims 1, 18 and 31 and all claims dependent therefrom are currently in condition for allowance.

In particular, Filterstar in view of Foster fails to disclose every limitation of the currently amended independent claim 1. Specifically, Filterstar in view Foster does not disclose a plurality of valve assemblies movably mounted vertically or horizontally based upon design configuration to manipulate flow of water in a desired pattern. In addition, Filterstar in view of Foster also does not disclose a plurality of valve assemblies movably mounted inside or outside of the aquarium wherein said valve assemblies regulate a flow rate.

Arguments/Remarks Page 9 of 12

In this regard, Filterstar does not disclose or otherwise teach the concept of utilizing a plurality of valve assemblies that can be movably mounted vertically or horizontally to manipulate the flow of water in a desired pattern as designed by the aquarist nor does Filterstar disclose that said valve assemblies are movably mounted inside or outside of the aquarium as currently claimed in claim 1. Filterstar merely arguably shows one valve assembly outside an aquarium mounted in one fixed position. Filterstar does not disclose or teach the concepts of using multiple valve assemblies, movably mounting said valve assemblies in multiple ways inside or outside of the aquarium to manipulate the flow of water in a customizably chosen desired pattern. In view of the foregoing, we believe that claim 1 is currently in condition for allowance. Therefore, we respectfully request that claim 1 be allowed.

Independent claim 18 was rejected for the same reasons that claim 1 was rejected. Claim 18 has been amended to more particularly point out the multiple movably located means for manipulating the flow of water wherein said multiple movably located means can be movably mounted vertically or horizontally and said multiple movably located means can be movably mounted inside or outside of the aquarium to manipulate the flow of water in a desired pattern as chosen by an aquarist. For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 18 is currently in condition for allowance.

Claim 31 has been amended to more particularly point out how the plurality of valve assemblies can be used to manipulate the flow of water in a desired pattern and at a desired flow rare by movably mounting the valve assemblies vertically or horizontally based upon design configuration and movably mounting the valve assemblies inside or outside of the aquarium as desired by the aquarist. As such, claim 31 is currently in condition for allowance.

Claim 33, dependent upon claim 1, was added to more particularly point out the idea of at least one of the valve assemblies is movably located in the water inside the aquarium. Since this element is not disclosed or otherwise taught in the prior art, we

Appl. No. 10/786,695 Amdt. Dated January 22, 2006

Reply to Office action of August 21, 2006

believe claim 33 is also in condition for allowance for this additional reason.

The remaining rejected claims all depend, directly or indirectly, upon independent claims 1, 18 and 31 discussed above, and thus are patentable over the reference for at least one of the reasons discussed.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35269US1.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:_

Gregory D. Fernengel, Reg. No. 57,330

1801 East 9th Street Suite 1200 Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108 (216) 579-1700

Date: January 22, 2006

Arguments/Remarks Page 11 of 12